*** THE HONOURABLE SRI JUSTICE B.SESHASAYANA REDDY**

-

-

+ WRIT PETITION NOS.12484, 12551, 12704, 12715, 12716, 12847,

13607 AND 13742 OF 2005

% 15-07-2005

C.M.R.VELU and others PETITIONERS

VS.

$ Convenor, EAMCET 2005 & other ..RESPONDENTS

! COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER: MR.CHALLASIVASANKAR

^ Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

< Gist:

> Head Note:

? CITATIONS:

1. AIR 1983 SC 1230
2. 1993 ALT SUPP.(1)287 (DB)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

FRIDAY, THE FIFTEENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FIVE

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE B.SESHASAYANA REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NOS.12484, 12551, 12704, 12715, 12716, 12847,

13607 AND 13742 OF 2005

-

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 12484 of 2005

Between:

C.M.R.Velu S/o.Late C.M.M. Chetty
R/o.B.1 Arjun Apartments Tarbund, Secunderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor, EAMCET 2005
JNTU, Kukatpally Hyderabad.

2 The Registrar NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particulars one in the nature of writ of mandamus calling for the answer script of CM.Prasanna Srinivas bearing Hall Ticket No.3530360 of the EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent No.1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st respondent and declare that the key answers valuation conducted by respondent No.1 in respect of question No.80 of Zoology and question No.18 of Botany is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a Government Collage in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.CHALLASIVASANKAR

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

WRIT PETITION NO : 12551 of 2005

Between:

K.Suribabu, S/o.K.Subba Rao,
24-1/8, Alwal, Secunderabad-10.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor, EAMCET-2005, JNTU, Kukatpally, Hyderabad.
2 The Registrar, NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ, order or direction more particulars one in the nature of writ of mandamus calling for the answer script of Deepak Koppaka bearing Hall Ticket No.3526274 of EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent No-1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st respondent and declare that the key answer valuation conducted by respondent No-1 in respect of Question No-80 of Zoology, and Question No.18 of Botany is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a govt College in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders.

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

WRIT PETITION NO : 12704 of 2005

Between:

Lomte Jal Kishan Rao s/o Late Nageshwar Rao
R/o 3-4-541/542, Narayanguda, Hyderabad

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor EAMCET-2005 JNTU, Kukatpally, Hyderabad
2 The Registrar NRT University of Health Science, Vijayawada

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ, order or direction more particulars one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus calling for the answer script of the petitioner bearing Hall Ticket No. 3528019 of the EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent NO.1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st respondent and declare that the key answers valuation conducted by respondent No.1 in respect of Question No-80 of Zoology, and Question NO. 18 of Botany is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a Govt. College in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

WRIT PETITION NO : 12715 of 2005

Between:

Dr. M. Visweswara Rao S/o. M. Sivaramakrishnaiah
R/o. Plot No.33, Malla Reddy Nagar, Lothkunta, Alwal, Secunderabad-10.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor, EAMCET-2005, JNTU, Kukatpally, Hyderabad.
2 The Registrar, NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ Order or direction more particulars one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus calling for the answer script of M. Sriram bearing Hall Ticket No. 3508146 of the EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent No.1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st Respondent and declare that the key answers valuation conducted by respondent No.1 in respect of Question No. 80 of Zoology, and Question No 18 of Botany and question No. 153 of Chemistry is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a Govt. Collage in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

WRIT PETITION NO : 12716 of 2005

Between:

V. Thrishi Sagna, D/o. Chandrasekhar,
R/o. S-4, Kasu Apartments, Bowenpally, Secunderabad - 11.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor, EAMCET-2005, JNTU, Kukatpally, Hyderabad.
2 The Registrar, NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court be pleased to issue a writ Order or direction more particulars one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus calling for the answer script of the petitioner bearing Hall Ticket No. 3514166 of the EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent No.1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st Respondent and declare that the key answers valuation conducted by respondent No.1 in respect of Question No. 80 of Zoology, and Question No 18 of Botany is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a Govt. Collage in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

WRIT PETITION NO : 12847 of 2005

Between:

G. Umamaheswar Rao, S/o. G. Venkat Rao,
96, Sidharthnagar, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor, EAMCET-2005, JNTU, Kukatpally, Hyderabad.
2 The Registrar, NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ Order or direction more particulars one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus calling for the answer script of G. Venkata Sreekanth bearing Hall Ticket No. 3514052 of the EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent No.1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st Respondent and declare that the key answers valuation conducted by respondent No.1 in respect of Question No. 80 of Zoology, and Question No 18 of Botany is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a Govt. Collage in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

WRIT PETITION NO : 13607 of 2005

Between:

Nagam Sekar Reddy, S/o. Nagam Venkat Reddy,
R/o. 303, Sri Sai Homes, Adikmet road, Vidyanagar, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor, EAMCET-2005, JNTU, Kukatpally, Hyderabad.
2 The Registrar, NTR University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a writ Order or direction more particulars one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus calling for the answer script of my daughter Nagam Manvi Reddy bearing Hall Ticket No. 3506387 of the EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent No.1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st Respondent and declare that the key answers valuation conducted by respondent No.1 in respect of Question No. 80 of Zoology, and Question No 18 of Botany is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a Govt. Collage in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

WRIT PETITION NO : 13742 of 2005

Between:

Akhila Ayyagari, D/o Krishna Mohan,
R/o 70/3RT, Vijayanagar Colony, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Convenor, EAMCET-2005, JNTU, Kukatpally, Hyderabad.
2 The Registrar, N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.

.....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court may be pleased to issue a Writ , Order or direction more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus calling for the answer script of the petitioner bearing Hall Ticket No. 3524040 of the EAMCET 2005 conducted by the respondent No.1 together with the key answers provided by the 1st respondent and declare that the key answers declared by R-1 in respect of Question No. 44, 49 and 80 of Zoology, and Question No. 18 and 19 of Botany is illegal and consequentially direct the respondents to grant new rank and allot one seat in MBBS in a Medical Collage in Osmania Region and pass such other order or orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the interest of justice.

Counsel for the Respondent No.1: Mr.K.Rathanga Pani Reddy, Standing Counsel for JNTU University.

Counsel for the Respondent No.2 : Mr.D.V.Nagarjuna Babu, Standing Counsel for NTR University for Health Sciences.

The Court made the following :

COMMON JUDGMENT:

1. All these writ petitions are inter-connected and they relate to EAMCET-2005, hence they are disposed of by this common judgment.

2. Entrance test for admission into engineering, Agricultural and Medical courses was held in the State of Andhra Pradesh on 29.4.2005. Initial key answers was issued on 12.5.2005 calling for objections from the students who attended the examination and from all other corners including experts and academicians to be submitted on or before 19.5.2005. The final key committee consisting of a set of subject experts met on 21.5.2005 and prepared the final key answers after good deal of deliberations on the subject basing on the standard material and also by considering objections. The final key answers recommended/ prepared by the final key committee has been approved by the high level EAMCET committee considering of Government of Andhra Pradesh, represented by its Principal Secretary, Higher Education, Commissioner of Technical Education, Vice Chancellor, JNTU University, Director, Andhra Pradesh, Telugu Academy, Convenor of EAMCET and others. Finally the results were released on 23.5.2005.

3. In these writ petitions the petitioners assailed key answers relating to question Nos.18 and 20 of Botany paper, question Nos.44, 49 and 80 of Zoology paper and question Nos.153 of Chemistry paper. However, the writ petitioner in W.P.No.13742 of 2005 who has assailed key answer to question No.44 of Zoology paper has not pressed his contention and therefore he confined the writ petition to question Nos.18 and 20 of Botany paper and question Nos.49 and 80 of Zoology paper. For better understanding I may mention the name of the candidate in each of the writ petitions and the question numbers assailed therein:

S.No.	Name of theCandidate	W.P.No.	RANK	QUESTION NO. ASSAILED	SUBJECT
1.	C.M.PRASANNA SRINIVAS	12484/05	1679	8018	ZOOLOGYBOTANY
2.	M.SRIRAM	12715/05	871	8018153	ZOOLOGYBOTANYCHEMISTRY
3.	DEEPAK KOPPAKA	12551/05	913	8018	ZOOLOGYBOTANY
4.	LOMTE JAI KISHAN RAO	12704/05	1050	8018	ZOOLOGYBOTANY
5.	V.THRISHI SAGNE	12716/05	2285	8018	ZOOLOGYBOTANY
6.	G.VENKATA SRIKANTH	12847/05	602	8018	ZOOLOGYBOTANY
7.	NAGAM MANVI REDDY	13607/05	783	8018	ZOOLOGYBOTANY
8.	AKHITA AYYAGARI	13742/05	2846	18204944(NOT PRESSED)80	BOTANYBOTANYZOOLOGYZOOLOGY ZOOLOGY

4. It is the contention of learned counsel appearing for the petitioners that the petitioners have answered the questions correctly and all of them have studied intermediate standard text books and therefore the answers written by them cannot be brushed aside. To demonstrate that the key answers are not correct for the questions referred to above, the learned counsel refers the relevant pages in the books published by Telugu Academy, Hyderabad, 2003 edition. Detailed submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners will be referred to in the foregoing paras of the judgment.

5. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 1st respondent-JNTU University submits that the key answers were prepared by a set of experts, academicians after a good deal of deliberations and every answer found in the key should be assumed to be correct unless it is demonstrably shown to this court that the answers are not correct. It is not open to this court sitting in Article 226 of the Constitution of India to interfere in Academic wisdom of the examiners in finalizing the answers found in a key. He would also submit that in academic matters this court should not show difference to the views of experts and should not embark upon an enquiry into the correctness or wisdom of the academicians. His further submission is that none of the petitioners or any one has raised objection to the initial key answer to Question No.20 and therefore it is not open to the petitioners to canvass that key answers to Question No.20 of Botany paper is not correct.

6. Before I consider the correctness or otherwise of the contentions raised in respect of each of the questions, I deem it appropriate to advert to the legal position.

7. In KANPUR UNIVERSITY V. SAMIR GUPTA the Supreme Court had to consider whether certain answers found in the key prepared by the examiners for the combined pre-medical tests in Uttar Pradesh were correct or not. The Supreme Court held that the key answer should be assumed to be correct unless it is proved to be wrong and that it should not be held to be wrong by an inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalization. It must be clearly demonstrated to be wrong, that is to say it must be such as no

reasonable body of men well versed in the particular subject would regard it as correct. In case of doubt, the key answers would have to be preferred. In CONVENOR, EAMCET-1992 v. A.SWAPNA a Division Bench of this Court, after examining various decisions, culled out the principles deducible there from as follows:

" 5. In Kanpur University v. Samir Gupta, the Supreme Court held that the key answer should be assumed to be correct unless it is proved to be wrong and that it should not be held to be wrong by an inferential process of reasoning or by a process of rationalization. It must be clearly demonstrated to be wrong, that is to say, it must be such as no reasonable body of men well versed in the particular subject would regard as correct. In case of doubt, the key answer would have to be preferred. In Convenor, EAMCET-92 v. A.Swapna a Division bench of this Court, after examining various decisions, culled out the principles deducible therefrom as follows:

1) Inspite of there being bar of revaluation of the answer scripts, the examinees are entitled to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and ask the Court to satisfy itself whether the key answers are correct and complete or wrong.

2) If the key answer is demonstrably wrong and the student's answer is correct, the candidate should be given mark (which can be called as Category 'A'.

3) If the student's answer is complete, while the key answer is incomplete though not wrong, the student gets mark (referred as Category-'B').

4) That in case the question is vague and ambiguous admitting of more than one answer, if the answer given by the student is correct, the student should be given a mark even though the student's answer is not one of the suggested answers in the key (Category 'C').

5) As conceded by the Convenor in his counter affidavit in the case of question yielding more than one correct answer, if the student gives any one of the answers suggested in the key, he will be entitled to the mark. (Category 'D').

6) If the student answer is incorrect or incomplete, while the key answer is complete, the student cannot get mark and it need not be proved that the key answer is wrong (Category 'E').

8. I may first consider the contention of the writ petitioners with regard to question Nos.18 and 20 of Botany paper. Question No.18 of Botany paper together with suggested answer reads thus:

" Assertion (A): All the endodermal cells of the root do not contain casparian thickenings on their radial and transverse walls.

Reason ® : Passage cells are found in the root endodermis.

i. Both (A) and ® are true. ® is the correct explanation of (A).

ii. Both (A) and ® are true but ® is not the correct explanation of (A)

iii. (A) is true but ® is false.

iv. (A) is false but ® is false."

The key answer to the above referred question is "option 4". Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that the said key is incorrect and the correct answer is "option 1". In support of his contention he placed reliance on page 220 of Intermediate First year Botany book (2003 edition) published by Telugu Academy, Hyderabad. Emphasis has been laid by him on passage relating to endodermis which reads as follows:

" Endodermis: The innermost layer of cortex is called 'endodermis'. It is well developed and clearly demarcated as a single layer of barrel shaped cells arranged compactly without leaving any intercellular spaces. The radial and transverse walls are wrapped by a lingo-subersed band called 'casparian band'. Certain endodermal cells positioned opposite to the protoxylem cells are thin walled and without casparian bands. These are known as 'passage cells' which help in the entry of water from the cortex into the stele."

It is explicit from the above passage that what is emphasized is certain endodermal cells. The assertion in question is all endodermal cells in the root do not contain casparian thickenings on their radial and transverse walls. Therefore, the assertion is false. Indeed the final key committee considered the objections raised by certain candidates with regard to the initial key. The final key committee considered this objection and over ruled the same with the following explanation.

" Option 4 only correct based upon explanation given below. The assertion given is – "All endodermal cells of root do not contain caspavan thickenings….." The endodermal tissue of the roots contains both types of cells though with casparian strips and those without casparian strips. As such assertion is wrong and reader is reason is right i.e., option 4 is correct.

If the assertion had been like "some of the endodermal cells do not contain casparian strips, then too option No.1 would have been correct. But the assertion in the question No.18 never gave some scope to think/speculate, because it is given as 'all endodermal cells'. Hence, the option (1) is not correct answer."

The explanation given by the key committee is explicit that objectors misunderstood "All the endodermal" cells as "Certain endoermal cells". Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that option No.1 is correct answer for question No.18 of Botany paper has no merit.

9. Question No.20 of Botany paper together with suggested answer reads as under:

" Which pairs of the following plants represent the condition of modification of stipules into spines.

i. Euphorbia & Zizyphus

ii. Citrus & Euphorbia

iii. Ziziphus & Beugainvillea

iv. Beugainvillea and citrus.

The key answer is option No.1. It is the contention of the petitioners that the said key is incorrect and the correct option is No.3. It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that the question itself is ambiguous and not correctly set. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners refers to page 50 of Intermediate First year Botany published by Telugu Academy, Hyderabad (2003 edition) wherein leaf modifications are dealt under the heading "Leaf modifications". It is explained as to the meaning of spines. It is profitable to refer the meaning of spines as explained by the authors of the book referred to above and it is thus:

" Spines: In some plants leaves are modified into sharp, pointed spines. They help in reducing the rate of transpiration in xerophytic plants and also protect the plants from herbivorous animals."

10. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for 1st respondent-University submits that Euphorbia and Ziziphus is the right pair which contains stipules as spines. Page 50 of Telugu Academy Botany book gives only one of the two plants namely Ziziphus where stipules are modified into spines. The remaining part of the question that refers to Euphorbia is mentioned along with Ziziphus at page No.252. Stipule is a part of leaf. Thorn differs from spines in structural function. In Boungainvillea thorns are found. Thorn is a modification of accelerate bud of stem and not a part of leaf/stipule. In page 252 of Chapter xerophytes under the heading Leaves it is stated that in some plants such as euphorbia and ziziphus, jujuba stipules become modified into spines. By referring to page 252 of the book (3 leaves-v) referred to above, I am in no doubt to conclude the key answer giving as option No.1 is inconformity with morophological features of leaves and therefore the contention of the petitioners that option No.3 is the correct answer has no merit.

11. Question No.49 of zoology paper together with suggested answers reads as under:

" Contractile tissues have the following features:

i. Mesodermal in origin.

ii. They contain stretch receptors

iii. Rhythmic contractions are seen in them

iv. They do not fatigue during the life of the animal.

Which of the above are characteristics of sphincters

i. All four.

ii. Only (i) , (ii), (iii)

iii. Only (i), (ii), (iv)

iv. Only (i), (iii), (iv).

Key answer is Option No.2. According to the petitioners option No.1 is the correct answer. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners by referring to page Nos.72, 74 and 75 of the Zoology text book of Telugu Academy (2003 edition) submits that option No.1 is the correct answer and since the writ petitioner in W.P.No.13742 of 2005 has marked option No.1, he is entitled to get one mark.

12. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for the 1st respondent- University submits that the question deals with the choosing of characteristic features of contractile elements such as smooth muscles. Smooth muscles are associated with digestive system and urinary bladder where sphincters play a regulatory role. It is his further contention that experts committee considered the suggestions and offered explanation for retention of option No.2 as the correct answer. The question deals with the choosing of the characteristic features of contractile tissues such as smooth muscles, structural muscles and cardiac muscles. Smooth muscles (visceral muscle) and cardiac muscles which are totally different and sphincters belonging to

smooth muscles. Page 74 of the same text book where difference between visceral muscle (smooth) and cardiac muscle is dealt with. There is subtle distinction between visceral muscle and cardiac muscle. The characteristic 4 i.e. they do not fatigue during the life time of the animal, is not the feature associated with smooth muscles. It is useful to refer the relevant passage in page 74 and it is thus:

" The individual muscle fibres of a smooth muscle are elongated, but of varying length and spindle shaped. Each fibre has a centrally placed nucleus which has a characteristic wavy outline and appears snake like when the muscle cell contracts. Bundles of smooth muscle fibres are enclosed in sheaths of loose connective tissue containing blood vessels and nerve fibres of the autonomic nervous system. Such bundles are arranged in sheets or layers. Unlike the striped muscles, the smooth muscles contract slowly and fatigue slowly. Also, unlike skeletal and cardiac muscles, the visceral muscle can remain in a state of partial contraction for a long time. When damaged new muscle time is regenerated from the special cells called pericytes."

It can be understood from the above referred passage that the characteristic 4 is not the feature associated with the smooth muscle. Therefore, the contentions of the learned counsel for the petitioners that option No.1 is correct answer has no substance and the same is liable to be rejected.

13. Question No.80 of zoology paper together with suggested answers reads as follows:

" The coelom of the animals which are commonly known as "tooth shells" originates

1) By enterocoelic method

2) By Schizocoelic method and filled with coelomic fluid

3) By splitting of embryonic mesoderm and filled with the blood

4) From the blastocoel.

The initial key prepared by 1st respondent-University indicated that Option No.3 is the correct answer. After calling for the suggestions, the final key committee changed the option from 3 to 2. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that both the options 2 and 3 are correct and they are similar in meaning and factual content. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that there are two methods of formation of eucoelom and the taxon eucoelomata is divided into two smaller taxa, Schizocoelomata and Enteroceolomata. The coelom formed in schizocoelomates is called schozocoel, and the coelom formed in enterocoelomates is called enterocoel. He refers to para 3.3.4(a) of chapter III which deals with animal organization (page 49) of the Intermediate First year Zoology text book published by Telugu Academy, Hyderabad (2003 edition).

14. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for 1st respondent- University submits that the same authors at para 7.8.2 of General Characters of Phylum and classification of Invertebrata phyla in page No.198 of the same book i.e. Intermediate First year Zoology published by Telugu Academy, Hyderabad (2003 edition) while discussing the general characteristics of arthropoda and mollusca have stated that the body cavity in mollusca is a haemocoel and true coelom is confined to kidneys, gonads and the heart, thereby they hinted that the haemocoel is not a true coelom in mollusca. Hence, the coelom mollusca is considered as coelom fluid field and in view of the same option 2 is the only correct answer. Thus, the information in Telugu

Academy text book at page 198 does not substantiate the contention of the counsel for the petitioners.

13(a). The final key committee on elaborate discussion as to the origin of coelom and its status in coelom has changed the option from 3 to 2. Therefore, the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioners that option 3 is also the correct answer has no merit.

15. Question No.153 of Chemistry paper together with suggested answers reads as under:

" What are the reagents and reaction conditions used for converting ethyl chloride to ethyl nitrite (as the major product)

i. KN02, C2H50H, H20

ii. Na No2, HCL, OC

iii. KCN, H20,

iv. AG NO2, C2H50H, H20

The key answer is option 4. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that option 1 is also the correct answer. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that ethyl chloride reacts with potassium nitrite in aqueous ethanolic solution to form ethyl nitrite as the main product though some nitro ethane is also obtained. Therefore, option 1 is also the correct answer. In support of his submission he refers to II year Intermediate Chemistry book published by Telugu Academy, Hyderabad (2003 edition) page 393.

16. Learned Standing Counsel appearing for 1st respondent-JNTU University submits that ethyl chloride and ethyl nitrite are formed in the reaction but ethyl nitrite is formed as a major product under the reaction conditions and therefore option 4 is the correct answer. In support of his submissions he refers to page 318 of Intermediate second year chemistry published by Telugu Academy (edition 2004). Chapter II deals with Carbon compounds. Para 11.1.2(B) deals with properties of ethyl chloride.

17. Ethyl chloride has physical properties as well as chemical properties. Ethyl chloride reacts with potassium or sodium nitrite to give nitro ethane as the major product. Since ethyl product is formed under major product under reaction conditions, option 4 is the correct answer. Therefore, I am unable to accede with the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that option 1 is also correct answer for question No.153 of Chemistry paper.

18. A feeble argument has been advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioners that final key answers and results of EAMCET were declared together on the same day which is quite unusual since in the earlier years final key answers were released prior to enhancement of EAMCET results. Release of final key answers, in my view, together with EAMCET results or a day earlier to EAMCET result does not make any difference since it is open to this court to examine whether the key answer is correct or not. In such a situation no prejudice is caused to the petitioners in case of key answers being released along with

EAMCET results.

19. In view of the above discussions, I find that these batch of writ petitions are devoid of merits and accordingly they are dismissed. No order as to costs.

Dated: 15-7-2005. (B.Seshasayana Reddy,J)

Tnb

LR copy to be marked.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR

// TRUE COPY //

SECTION OFFICER

One fair copy to the Honourable Sri Justice

B.Seshasayana Reddy (for his Lordships kind perusal)

To

1. The Convenor, EAMCET-2005, JNTU University, Kukatpally, Hyderabad.
2. The Registrar, N.T.R. University of Health Sciences, Vijayawada.
3. 8 LR copies.
4. The Under Secretary, Union of India, Ministry of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, New Delhi.
5. The Secretary, A.P. Advocates Association Library, High Court Buildings, Hyderabad.
6. Two CD copies.